REMARKS

Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1-30 and 32-34 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 9, and 26 are the independent claims. Claim 26 has been amended. No new matter is believed to have been added.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3-5, 8-11, 14, 15, 19-22, 24-26, 29, 30 and 32-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated U.S. Patent No. 6,084,843 (<u>Abe et al.</u>). This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner asserts that FIG. 9 shows a HO that separately guides the first and second light beams in to a common optical path. However, it is respectfully submitted that neither the grating 22A nor the holographic optical element (HOE) 25 meets the invention as recited in claims 1 and 9.

By way of review, independent claim 1 recites, among other features, a hologram light coupler to separately guide the first and second light beams along a common optical path to the respective first and second recording media. Claim 1 further recites that "the hologram light coupler is disposed between the light device module and the optical path changing unit."

Additionally, independent claim 9 recites, among other features, a light coupler to receive the first and second light beams incident at different angles on a surface, and to transmit and/or diffract portions of the received first and second light beams along the emitting optical path, the light coupler being disposed between the light device module and the optical path changing unit.

In contrast, Abe et al. teaches a recording and reproducing apparatus that includes a compound laser diode 21 and a grating 22A disposed between of the laser diode 21 and a beam splitter 23. The first laser chip 21A is disposed off the optical axis of the refractive objective lens while the second optical chip 21B is disposed on the optical axis of the refractive objective lens such that light emitted from the chip 21A passes through the grating 22A while light emitted from the chip 21B does not pass through the grating. (Abe et al., Figs. 9 and 10). As such, the grating 22A does not receive light from both chips 21A, 21B.

Further, while Abe et al. teaches the use of a holographic optical element (HOE) 25, the HOE 25 is disposed between the beam splitter 23 and the CD 41A and DVD 41B. Thus, the grating 22A of Abe et al. and the HOE 25 do not meet the aforementioned features of independent claims 1 and 9.

Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are respectfully requested.

For at least similar reasons, it is respectfully submitted that <u>Abe et al.</u> does not disclose or suggest the invention of claim 26.

Claims 3-5, 8, 10, 11, 14, 15, 19-22, 24, 25, 29, 30, and 32-34 are deemed patentable due at least to their depending from corresponding claims 1, 9, and 26.

CONCLUSION:

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. And further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited and possibly concluded by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss any such remaining issues.

If there are any additional fees associated with the filing of this Response, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUILLP

James G. McEwen Registration No. 41,983

1400 Eye Street, NW Suite 300

Washington, D.C. 20005 Telephone: (202) 216-9505 Facsimile: (202) 216-9510

Date: FEB. 22, 2008